

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1 - 7 and 9 - 24 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 8. Claim 8 was canceled.

Claims 1 - 7 and 9 - 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by USP 6,256,515 to Cox et al. ("Cox"). In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitation of claim 8. Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Cox.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner has taken the position that call management center 100 and mobile switching center 60 disclose the "at least one base station". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Call management center 100 and mobile switching center 60 of Cox is separate from wireless network 40 (see Fig. 1). In contrast, the base station of Applicant's invention is part of a wireless network (see p. 1, lines 6 – 13 of the specification). Thus, the cited portions of Cox do not disclose the "at least one base station".

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 (whose limitation is now in claim 1), stating that "Cox discloses that whether the rules apply depends at least on whether the at least one terminal is wirelessly connected to the at least one base station but otherwise does not depend on the location of the at least one terminal (Fig. 1, 3 and column 8, lines 32 – column 9, lines 57)." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cox teaches "determine[ing] whether [a] call is approved by consulting a database of approved telephone numbers" (Cox abstract). However, Cox does not teach or suggest "whether the rules apply depends at least on whether the at least one terminal is wirelessly connected to the at least one base station but otherwise does not depend on the location of the at least one terminal." It appears that even the possible information in the reports does not include information on whether a terminal is wirelessly connected to a base station (see col. 9, lines 4 – 20). In contrast, in the present invention whether rules apply may depend on to which base station a terminal is connected (see p. 5, Table 2 and lines 8 – 24 of the specification).

Based on at least the arguments set forth hereinabove, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9, stating that Cox discloses "accessing at least one database to look up rules governing restriction on a base station connected to the one of a plurality of terminals (Fig. 1, 3 and column 10, lines 10 – column 11, lines 58)." Applicant

respectfully disagrees. Cox teaches “determine[ing] whether [a] call is approved by consulting a database of approved telephone numbers.” (Cox abstract). Depending on the telephone number, whether an acceptable access code or account number is entered, and whether the phone is a controlled phone, the call will or will not go through (see col. 10, line 10 – col. 11, line 58). However, Cox does not teach or suggest “accessing at least one database to look up rules governing restriction on a base station connected to the one of a plurality of terminals.” In contrast, in the present invention, there may be rules governing restriction on a base station connected to one of a plurality of terminals (see p. 5, Table 2 and lines 8 – 24 of the specification).

Based on at least the arguments set forth hereinabove, independent claim 9 is believed to be allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17, stating that Cox discloses “accessing at least one database to look up rules governing restriction on a base station receiving a signal from a terminal associated with a request for an outgoing communication (Fig. 1, 3 and column 5, lines 40 – column 6, lines 65)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cox teaches “determine[ing] whether [a] call is approved by consulting a database of approved telephone numbers.” (Cox abstract). Depending on the telephone number, whether an acceptable access code or account number is entered, and whether the phone is a controlled phone, the call will or will not go through (see col. 10, line 10 – col. 11, line 58). However, Cox does not teach or suggest “accessing at least one database to look up rules governing restriction on a base station receiving a signal from a terminal associated with a request for an outgoing communication.” In contrast, in the present invention, there may be rules governing restriction on a base station receiving a signal from a terminal associated with a request for an outgoing communication (see p. 5, Table 2 and lines 17 – 19 of the specification).

With respect to claim 17, the Examiner has further stated that Cox discloses “connecting the terminal for the outgoing communication if allowed, wherein the allowance depends at least on the restriction on the base station (Fig. 1, 3, column 7, lines 44 – column 8, lines 67, and column 5, lines 40 – column 6, lines 65)” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cox teaches “determine[ing] whether [a] call is approved by consulting a database of approved telephone numbers.” (Cox abstract). Depending on the telephone number, whether an acceptable access code or account number is entered, and whether the phone is a controlled phone, the call

will or will not go through (see col. 10, line 10 – col. 11, line 58). However, Cox does not teach or suggest “connecting the terminal for the outgoing communication if allowed, wherein the allowance depends at least on the restriction on the base station.” In contrast, in the present invention, allowance may depend at least on the restriction on the base station (see p. 5, Table 2 and lines 17 – 19 of the specification).

Based on at least the arguments set forth hereinabove, independent claim 17 is believed to be allowable.

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims 2 - 7, 10 - 16, and 18 - 24 because Applicant believes that, as the independent claims 1, 9, and 17 from which the dependent claims depend are allowable for at least those reasons discussed *supra*, the dependent claims are allowable for at least similar reasons. Applicant however, reserves the right to address such rejections should such be necessary.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that claims 1 - 7 and 9 - 24 as pending are allowable over the prior art of record, and respectfully request that the respective rejections be withdrawn and the application allowed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.

No fees are believed to be due for this response, however, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fees to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Montgomery

Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830
(732) 321-3130